

# **Report on a Technical Assistance Visit**

## **Professional Services Division**

### **June 2008**

#### **Overview of this Report**

A summary of the Technical Assistance visit to William Jessup University will be given.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

This is an information item.

#### **Background**

New institutions, upon approval of their initial educator preparation programs, are assigned to one of the seven accreditation cohorts. In order to provide feedback to the new sponsors on their program implementation to date, and to report to the COA on the progress of the programs, Technical Assistance visits are provided two years prior to their accreditation site visit. The Technical Assistance visits scheduled for 2007-08 are to William Jessup University and Touro University. This item reports on the visit to William Jessup University as the Touro University has not yet occurred and is scheduled for June 22-24, 2008.

William Jessup University was granted initial approval to offer a multiple-subject credential program in January 2005. The institution was assigned to the yellow cohort, which means the University will host an accreditation site visit in 2009-10. The following table provides basic information about the visit:

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Date of Visit</b>	<b>CTC Consultant</b>	<b>Team Size</b>	<b>Program(s) Reviewed</b>
William Jessup University	April 29-30, 2008	Rebecca Parker	2 Volunteers	Multiple Subject Program

William Jessup University was well prepared for the Technical Assistance Visit. There was a schedule for interviews and a document room that was equipped with a laptop computer. The CTC staff and volunteers followed many of the procedures that are utilized in a traditional accreditation site visit. The major difference was that no standard findings were decided by the team and no accreditation recommendation was considered or mentioned. Rather, the team provided feedback to the University about the adequacy of evidence provided to demonstrate that all standards were being addressed by the program.

The reviewers and consultant interviewed the leadership at the campus, as well as numerous faculty members, candidates, graduates, employers, and an advisory board member. The team visited two elementary schools in the Rocklin Unified School District including one traditional K-6 and one charter school. Both schools serve as sites for candidates to do their fieldwork and have hired graduates as classroom teachers. In both cases, interviewees lauded the professionalism and preparedness of William Jessup candidates.

At the conclusion of the visit, the team prepared a technical assistance report that was presented to the institution. This report included the professional comments of the reviewers for each of

the current standards, the new common standards (since the accreditation visit will require the institution to write to the new common standards), and additional evidence for the institution to consider as they prepare for their accreditation visit. A brief summary of the recommendations to the institution regarding the adequacy of documentation on program activities, candidate competencies, and program effectiveness are shown in the table below. The team recommended that all standards documents be updated to reflect what is actually happening in the program. The team believed that those activities, if done collaboratively among administrators, faculty, and adjunct faculty, would ensure that the program is being offered consistently and that procedures are in place to identify weaknesses. Notwithstanding the recommendations, the team agreed that the institution has built a solid foundation for its current program.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Preconditions document, Common Standards, Multiple Subject Program Standards	Update to reflect current program operations and activities
<b>Common Standards</b>	
Admission	Inconsistent evidence about ease of transferring into WJU teacher preparation program
School Collaboration	Inconsistent evidence that candidates were exposed to EL, low income, and special education students in field experiences
<b>Multiple Subject Program Standards</b>	
2) Collaboration	TEAC does not show evidence that candidates and completers participate
3) Relationships between Theory and Practice	Documentation suggests that the relationship needs to be enhanced
11) Preparation to use Educational Ideas and Research	Provide evidence of student work/portfolios.
12) Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning...	Aggregate scores in preparation for site visit (and biennial report). Gather data from completers as part of program review.
13) Preparation to Teach English Learners	Need evidence that shows candidates have multiple interactions with English Learner students
14) Preparation to Teach Special Populations	Need evidence that shows candidates have multiple interactions with students with disabilities in the K-12 classroom.
16) Selection of Fieldwork Sites	Written criteria is needed citing specific requirements to be a university supervisor.
18) Pedagogical Assignments...	No evidence of student work was provided, whether on paper or in Task Stream.
21) Assessment Administration...	Collect, analyze, and utilize data on candidate competencies that is collected by faculty